

MEETING MINUTES
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSIT COMMITTEE

March 8, 2012
Maricopa Association of Governments; Saguaro Room;
302 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

*ADOT: Mike Normand	Peoria: Maher Hazine
Avondale: Kristen Sexton for Rogene Hill	Phoenix: Neal Young
*Buckeye: Andrea Marquez	*Queen Creek: Tom Condit
Chandler: Dan Cook for RJ Zeder	Scottsdale: Madeline Clemann
#El Mirage: Lance Calvert	Surprise: David Kohlbeck
#Gilbert: Ken Maruyama	Tempe: Greg Jordan
Glendale: Cathy Colbath, Chair	*Tolleson: Chris Hagen
Goodyear: Cato Esquivel	Valley Metro Rail/Metro: Wulf Grote
Maricopa County DOT: Mitch Wagner	*Youngtown: Grant Anderson
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Mike James	Regional Public Transportation Authority:
*Paradise Valley: William Mead	Carol Ketcherside

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy. + - Attended by Videoconference
- Attended by Audioconference

OTHERS PRESENT

Eileen Yazzie, MAG	Terry Johnson, Glendale
Alice Chen, MAG	Christine McMurdy, Goodyear
Jorge Luna MAG	Jeff Martin, Mesa
Marc Pearsall, MAG	Robert Yabes, Tempe
Kristen Sexton, Avondale	Ben Limmer, METRO
Jenna Goad, Glendale	Bob Antila, Valley Metro/RPTA
	Mike Sabatini, Baker

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Chair Cathy Colbath. Chair Colbath welcomed everyone in attendance and announced that a quorum was present. She noted that the following members were joining the meeting by teleconference, Mr. Ken Maruyama of Gilbert, and Mr. Lance Calvert of El Mirage. Chair Colbath asked if there were any public comment cards, and there being none, proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

2. Approval of Draft February 9, 2012 Minutes

Chair Colbath asked if there were any comments or corrections to the Draft February 9, 2012 meeting minutes. Hearing no comments or corrections to the meeting minutes, Chair Colbath called for a motion to approve the draft meeting minutes. Mr. Mitch Wagner of Maricopa County DOT moved to approve the motion. Mr. David Kohlbeck seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

Chair Colbath stated that she had not received any request to speak cards from the audience and moved onto the next item on the agenda.

4. Transit Program Manager's Report

Chair Colbath introduced Ms. Eileen Yazzie of MAG who presented her Transit Program Manager's Report.

Ms. Yazzie began by noting that she had three items to report on. She thanked everyone present as well as MAG member agency staff for all of the work they had been doing in participating with the four ongoing MAG transit studies: the Sustainable Transportation and Land Use Integration Study, the Designing Transit Accessible Communities Study, the Southwest Valley Local Transit System Study, and the Northwest Valley Local Transit System Study. She noted that all of the staff's time commitments and input were valued by MAG in order to have successful studies. She also mentioned that the Southwest Valley Local Transit System Study had an online survey on the MAG website available for review as well as on April 5th there would be public forum for the study. She explained that the consultant selection for the Northwest Valley Local Transit System Study was underway. She concluded by informing the committee that there was forthcoming information on a proposed follow-up trip to Salt Lake City for a multi-modal transit tour on June 14-15, 2012 for MAG region public and private members who were interested in participating.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report and update and asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

5. 2012 Federal Discretionary Grants

Chair Colbath introduced Ms. Alice Chen of MAG who presented her 2012 Federal Discretionary Grants Update. Chair Colbath noted that it was on the agenda for possible action. Ms. Chen began her presentation by referring to a timeline of her process as well as noting that this was her third visit to the Transit Committee regarding the topic. She described the progress between the previous Transit Committee meeting in February and the current meeting.

Ms. Chen then elaborated that during the last Transit Committee meeting, it was recommended that the Transit Operators Working Group return to their workshop to look at ways to achieve maximum funding for the region, and to provide funding for projects that have the most benefit to the most number of people – either directly or indirectly. She also briefed the committee on workshop objectives, the need for a transparent process, and identifying the best regional projects. She said that the group identified projects most likely to get funding out of the \$200 million in request, and recommend funding amounts associated with each project that the Group deemed most likely to receive funding and were most beneficial for the region. She noted however that not all projects were recommended, and that the group was not setting policy or guidelines.

Ms. Chen further explained a livability assessment, and a quick overview of how projects were awarded nationally. She said that the summary was based on the descriptions of projects that were awarded funding and that the percentages were total award funds. She said that intermodal centers included administrative buildings and had the highest percentage of funding, which was partly due to the high funding amount typically allocated to a winning project. She added that there were actually more projects awarded in the accessibility and livability category but the funding for each was smaller.

She further commented that under State of Good Repair, the most significant criteria noticed was that fleet that were funded for replacement all had language that stipulated that it met or was beyond useful life. She added that as a region, we had prioritized fleet replacement in our formula grants and therefore they were generally not under this category. For maintenance facilities, she noticed that they often funded specific improvements and that there was a good number of technology related projects funding, most notably higher if asset management was added. She also briefly discussed clean fuels. She then referred the members to attachments 1A and 1B. Discussion followed on criteria for the categories and the findings.

Ms. Chen then discussed the various deadlines associated with the grant applications. She reviewed them in the following order: State of Good Repair, \$650M with a MAG deadline of 10:00 am CST - March 8, 2012 and an FTA - 11:59 pm EDT - March 22, 2012; then Livability - \$125M, with a MAG deadline of 10:00 am CST - March 15, 2012; FTA 11:59 pm EDT - March 29, 2012; then Clean Fuels - \$51.5M, with a MAG deadline of 10:00 am CST March 22, 2012, FTA - 11:59 pm EDT - April 5, 2012.

Ms. Chen also clarified that the submitted proposals needed the following required elements: 1.) Documentation of local match (CIP, budget, letter of commitment); 2.) support letter from city manager's office; 3.) completed application including project cost estimate; 4.) NEPA documents if necessary; 5.) Fleet information if necessary. The submittals were due to MAG

2 weeks before federal submittal deadline – 10AM no exceptions. Ms. Chen concluded that the item was on the agenda for information, discussion, and recommendation to approve moving forward with the grant application process with the ten (10) projects that were identified by transit operators as MAG regional projects. She added that she would entertain any comments or questions.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Chen for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Dan Cook of Chandler asked about the rationale for the Bus Engine Repair item not being included on the recommended list. Ms Chen replied that the way that the rating was tabulated, the items included in the TIP of CIP were considered first, and even some good projects fell by the wayside because they were not the most likely to be funded for the good of the region. Ms. Chen noted that the projects that were being submitted for were all currently planned to receive funding in the TIP, so any new federal dollars that may be allocated to them in a successful grant application, could then be supplanted to help offset other needs with regional dollars. Discussion followed.

Mr. Neal Young of Phoenix asked for clarification on the FTA requirements for the grant applications and that there may be a limit to the amount of paperwork and support letters in the application submittal. He offered that Phoenix would like to recommend each City Manager submit a letter of support to MAG, where the letters would then be bundled and that MAG would in turn one letter of support to the FTA as a show of coordinated effort. Ms. Chen said that she did not get the impression from the FTA that they were limiting the amount of attachments. Discussion followed.

Ms. Chen established that the grant applications would be submitted to MAG, then MAG staff would then coordinate with City of Phoenix or RPTA staff so that the applications could then be uploaded through Grants.gov. Mr. Neal Young then offered that it would be preferred that a single, consolidated letter from MAG to the FTA would be the best way to underscore the region's joint, community-wide efforts. Mr. Grote added that the FTA prefers coordinated efforts in a single document. Discussion followed.

Mr. Young moved to approve moving forward with the grant application process, as discussed with the revised eight (8) projects that were identified by transit operators as MAG regional projects, and as additionally discussed, include a single, coordinated support letter by MAG, to be submitted to the FTA. Mr. Cook seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Chen for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

6. MAG Region Transit Studies and Projects Summary

Chair Colbath introduced Mr. Marc Pearsall of MAG who referred to attachment MAG Region Transit Studies and Projects Summary.

Mr. Pearsall added that he did not have a formal presentation, and instead referred the members

to the attachment Agenda Item 6, Attachment 2. He noted that at previous transit committee meetings, MAG staff had been requested to prepare a summary list of all of the current MAG Region transit studies and projects. He added that the information was culled from MAG's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and included studies partaken by MAG, City of Phoenix, RPTA, Metro and others. He also added that considering there were routinely a number of concurrent studies commencing simultaneously, that the attachment was a good tool so that the members could understand both the status and details of new and ongoing studies issued in the Valley, as well as recently completed studies.

Mr. Pearsall gave an overview of the newest and proposed studies for FY13 and also mentioned that over the next year, MAG staff would be working to consolidate the transit sections of the UPWP into a more concise section that was easier to access for the reader, as the transit components were currently spread out over multiple sections with the document.

Chair Colbath thanked Mr. Pearsall for his report adding that it was nice to have all of the current and proposed MAG and regional transportation and transit projects in one comprehensive document. She asked if there were any questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

7. Reprogramming of Glendale Park and Ride/Transit Center and Preventive Maintenance Distribution of 5309-FGM Funds

Chair Colbath welcomed back Ms. Eileen Yazzie of MAG to brief the committee on an update regarding reprogramming of Glendale Park and Ride/Transit Center and Preventive Maintenance Distribution of 5309-FGM Funds.

Ms. Yazzie explained that agenda items 7, 8 and 9 were all related and linked, adding that a change in one of the items would effect the other items. She said that number 7 was on for action, but that eight and nine were on for information and discussion and also noted that there was some revised material that was sent to everyone on Monday March 5th. She also referred everyone to a revised calculation for Agenda Item #9 which was emailed out on Wednesday March 7th.

She explained that MAG staff and RPTA staff had worked with City of Glendale staff to reprogram the Glendale Park and Ride/Transit Center. She referred to the memorandum which explained the scenario for the Glendale facility. She noted that project was currently undergoing a site location analysis and funding for right of way and construction needs to be moved from their respective years: 2010, 2011, and 2012 to 2012 and 2013 to not jeopardize funds not being used in time and expiring. The outcome of this reprogramming effort leaves unprogrammed balances from FY2010 and FY2011 5309-FGM, 5307, and STP-flex funds. Ms. Yazzie further explained that since this was a scheduling issue, that MAG staff felt that there was risk in leaving the project with 2010 funds and that the project may not be able to use those funds by the end of 2013. In order to lessen the risk, MAG suggested to Glendale and RPTA a variety of funding scenarios and it was mutually agreed upon to move funds to 2013 in order to lessen the risk of any expiring funds as well as aligning the project to where it was supposed to be as a regional priority and a longtime item from the Transit Lifecycle Program.

Ms. Yazzie then discussed the chain of events beyond this reprogramming of funds. The result was that funds in 2010-2011 would be made available for 5309-Flex, funds that may only be used for fixed guideway service: routes in dedicated right-of-ways and HOV, and on rail, and that they should be used for preventive maintenance. Right of way funds would be moved to 2012 and a small increase of PM funds in 2012 as well, with construction funds of approximately \$6.7 million to 2013. Further explanation discussion followed.

She explained how 5309 fixed-guideway modernization funds would be distributed. She noted that FGM funds were under a formula created in Scenario 3 which was based upon distribution via fixed guideway revenue miles and an entire year of METRO revenue miles. She added that this distribution was previously discussed in 2010, and a methodology was approved as a non-precedent setting distribution. She inquired with the members if they wanted to continue using the currently established Scenario 3 formula, or would they prefer a different set of scenarios. She added that a decision was not needed that day, but that answers and decisions were needed by the time staff begin formulating the new Program of Projects.

Ms. Yazzie summarized that the item was on the agenda for information, discussion, and action to recommend the reprogramming of the Glendale Park and Ride/Transit Center as shown in the attached tables, and the distribution of FY2010 and FY2011 5309-FGM funds for preventive maintenance. Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Cook of Chandler thanked staff for the information. He inquired if it was correct that the region was deleting \$16 million in funds, but only reprogramming \$12 million. Ms. Yazzie clarified that one of the items was a duplicate clerical entry that was captured in another previous line item, and then the second item was actually combined with another project under a new title. She followed by noting that she would show a clarified table that shows the correct information. Mr. Cook thanked Ms. Yazzie for the correction.

Mr. Greg Jordan inquired as to a clarification on why there was an impact to PM and requested a comprehensive table that showed the PM allocations and impacts from FY2011 through 2015 as had been the customary standard in the past. Discussion followed. Ms. Yazzie replied that PM funds were based upon the supposition that there were no capital projects within the plan in the future, however the Glendale P&R was a regional project still in the lifecycle program, and was an exception to that assumption. She offered that MAG staff could prepare a draft Program of Projects that featured capital projects for 2013, showing the deferred capital projects, which in turn free up funds for PM. Additional discussion regarding light rail capital projects followed.

Ms. Yazzie offered a suggestion that she could prepare a holistic report detailing projects in FY 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 plus a mini update and modifications to that report along with a summary of its effect on remaining funds for preventive maintenance and close-out. She added that the members need not taken action on this item so that she may return with that report at the next meeting in April. Discussion followed.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie and noted that she would re-present the information in a new format at the next meeting and asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

8. Federal Fiscal Year 2012 DRAFT Transit Program of Projects for Federal Funds

Chair Colbath requested that Ms. Yazzie continue with a presentation on Federal Fiscal Year 2012 DRAFT Transit Program of Projects for Federal Funds.

Ms. Yazzie noted that this was just a preliminary draft that had been developed with MAG member agencies that featured Transit Program projects for TIP in the current federal fiscal year. She explained that this was draft information and requested that each agency review the items in the table to ensure that the information was correct. She noted that she had been working with Surprise to address their project and advised any members to contact her directly with any comments, suggestions or changes.

She elaborated that the final FFY 2012 Transit Program of Projects would not be approved until the funding is authorized by US Congress. She added that if Congress issues a Continuing Resolution through June, then the members would need to approve a list valid through the end of June in order to get the grants started, then amend the TIP accordingly.

Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

9. Additional FFY2012 CMAQ Funds Available to Transit Projects

Chair Colbath requested that Ms. Yazzie continue with a presentation on Additional FFY2012 CMAQ Funds Available to Transit Projects

Ms. Yazzie noted that this item was a continuation of an item that was previously discussed in February. She explained that she had compiled information regarding closeout and what its implications were for Preventive Maintenance for one year as well as looking at a variety of scenarios. Scenario One looked at distributing all \$25 million to PM for one year. Scenario 2 included a reprogramming spread over two years. Scenario 3 was assembled based on a request from the previous committee where the methodology reflects \$25 million distributed for vehicle revenue miles. She noted that the Transit Committee had previously requested that additional ideas for funding other capital projects not be excluded from the discussion, specifically transit facilities and light rail. Ms. Yazzie completed her presentation and deferred to Chair Colbath who thanked Ms. Yazzie and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Chair Colbath asked a clarifying question regarding the inclusion of the Glendale Transit Facility that was due for reprogramming for 2012-2013 within this item. Ms. Yazzie responded that it did not due to the fact that the Glendale Transit Facility was included within agenda item #7 and that it would be approved through the passage of agenda item #7. Ms. Yazzie reiterated the recommendation that she will prepare a holistic report detailing projects in FY 2012, 2013,

2014 and 2015 plus a mini update and modifications to that report along with a summary of its effect on remaining funds for preventive maintenance. She added that she would return with that report at the next meeting in April. Ms. Yazzie also noted that the item was not on the agenda for action. Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Mr. Mike James of Mesa thanked Ms. Yazzie for the report and said he looked forward to the revised version of the report with the consolidated tables for April's meeting. He noted that Mesa supported the PM funding methodology, but was also interested in some of the funds being allocated to transit studies. Ms. Yazzie offered a followup question to Mr. James and any of the other members who may want to look at funding other transit studies. She advised that from this point forward, the members needed to be very specific about the Alternative Analysis (AA) study projects that they would be requesting, along with a description of what the study perimeters are and what the cost figure being requested, so that the revised holistic summary of projects may be completed with the most accurate and complete information.

Mr. James replied that the cities interested in looking at new studies would need to sit down and discuss the types of studies and their costs, and then get back to MAG within a couple of weeks with the information. Ms. Yazzie responded that it would be beneficial for the Transit Committee members who are not members of Valley Metro Rail if Mr. James could elaborate the specific types of AA projects that the METRO members were considering, the timing of the project openings and the amount of funds required in the request. Mr. James replied that they would need to discuss that further as he noted that he did not have those answers at the current time. Ms. Yazzie then asked Mr. Wulf Grote if he had any further information for the benefit of the members. Mr. Grote responded that there were a number of projects being requested for Alternatives Analysis within the upcoming year. He added that some of the projects were programmed in the long range program and then there were a few that were new interests. Mr. Grote noted that he did not have all of the facts and figures with him at present, but recalled a variety of proposed AA studies: the Phoenix-West Corridor was in the AA program; there was also programmed funding for the Glendale AA; there was a request for continuing work on the South Central Corridor which was ongoing; there was interest in doing environmental work for the Gilbert Road extension of the Central East light rail Corridor; there was also interest by Tempe and Mesa on the proposed Rio Salado Parkway Streetcar extension AA between Wrigleyville (Mesa) and Downtown Tempe.

Ms. Yazzie inquired with a few additional questions and comments. She asked if Mr. Grote could approximate the funds related to those five AA corridors. He replied that he would have to research the request and get back to the Committee with the information. He offered that he did have the estimates, but that they were not presently with him. Ms. Yazzie noted that she had previously reviewed the cost information in one of METRO's publications and Mr. Grote responded that it was included in one of their pamphlets. She asked if anyone currently had that pamphlet available and Mr. Jordan presented a copy of the small pamphlet for her to review. She explained that the total amount requested from METRO for the corridor Alternatives Analysis studies was \$11 million, which would drop the available funds for Preventive Maintenance from \$25 million down to \$14 million if the region selected in moving forward with that scenario.

Ms. Yazzie also mentioned that MAG staff had followed up with the FTA representative about using CMAQ funds or 5307 funds for Alternatives Analysis. The FTA was very concerned with this because Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds must be linked with a construction project, but none of these projects were prepared for construction at current time. She further noted the FTA's concern and discomfort with spending CMAQ or 5307 funds for two projects not currently listed within the region's RTP or TIP, namely the Gilbert Road Extension or the Rio Salado Parkway Streetcar. The FTA responded to MAG staff with probing questions of why the region would engage in studying projects not in any long range transportation plans, and they also took issue with the presumed distant opening service dates of some of the corridors, especially in light of the region's transit service reductions, deficit and potential fare increases.

She explained that the FTA made it very clear that if the region moved forward with issuing funds for some of these studies, that the FTA would request a one-on-one conversation with the region's operators who would sponsor these studies. The FTA would be checking to ensure that if CMAQ funds were used for AA's, that the issuing agency must show that they had 50% of the project's projected capital cost already identified and budgeted for construction. Ms. Yazzie noted that while this was the region's decision to make in regards to how to allocate this \$25 million, the FTA heeded sound advice on how to proceed in a prudent manner in light of the region's budget challenges.

Mr. Neal Young of Phoenix recommended that due of the reduction of services both locally and regionally, he noted that his office was receiving many political and public comments regarding the diminishing services for bus passengers' needs, and that some of these requests for further studies were counterproductive when the needs of the passengers of today should be addressed first. Mr. Young stated that the supported moving forward with option one or two and that he felt that spending time and resources talking about AA's for projects far in the future was not prudent especially when there are serious problems to address in the Preventive Maintenance of the fleets. He advised that we should stay focused on the basics and what the region needs in the near term and move forward quickly by making a decision within the next month.

Mr. Jordan said that he appreciated everyone's comments, but noted that despite the current economic climate, the region still needed to plan for the future. Discussion followed. Ms. Madeline Clemann responded that even though Scottsdale has no light rail mileage and indirectly benefits from the rail system via its connections in Tempe, the city was concerned with potentially losing much needed PM funds and bus service at the expense of funding rail studies that are not even included in any long range transit plan. Discussion followed.

Mr. Young commented that no one believes that we should stop planning for the future. However, he noted that the moneys that were available for today's operations and PM needs, might be siphoned off for studies for rail projects that were 12-14 years into the future. He added that for every federal dollar received today for operations or PM would in turn reduce costs for everyone, therefore the saved dollars that were supplanted by federal allocations could then be used for the Alternatives Analysis that some agencies are requesting. He added that this would allow those interested agencies to then spend their own local funds on AA's without having to involve the funding of the entire region. Discussion followed.

Mr. Grote offered a clarification on the \$11 million provided by Eileen in regards to the AA project listing for METRO. He added that the funds were for a three-year duration, not a one year period. He noted that there was a new potential grant opportunity coming this Spring, the Annual Alternatives Analysis program from the FTA, which METRO was planning to apply for which may take some burden off of the issue before the committee. He also offered that METRO values the need to keep bus service operating for the benefit of the region and for linking passengers to the rail system. He said that METRO realizes the importance of PM, but that how to balance PM's needs with the remaining needs of future study-work was something that deserved continued discussion.

Mr. Jordan added that he believes he was one of the biggest and most consistent champions of PM, but noted caution in how to respond to large spikes in PM funding. He advocated that the region should be prioritizing a significant and stable annual funding stream for PM so that they may be relied upon moving forward. He said that this would assist in weathering the storm during down economies. Discussion followed.

Mr. Cook thanked all of the comments from the members. He agreed with analyzing all options and the importance of future planning, but he said that the realities were people are coming to public meetings pleading for continued bus service because their jobs were at stake. He said that weighed in a balanced approach against this reality, planning simply becomes less important for the greater good of providing much needed transit service. Ms. Yazzie summarized that it appeared the most crucial issue facing the members for this agenda item was should we carve out a portion of the funds for Alternatives Analysis. She said that in order to move forward, the members should provide some advice and estimates on how much should be set aside for a potential Scenario 4; providing funds for AA's. She invited input from the committee. Discussion followed.

Mr. Young mentioned that the vehicle revenue miles option for Scenario 3 was not what the committee or the elected officials in the region had previously agreed to in 2011, so he advised that the committee stick with the agreed upon methodology. Discussion followed. Mr. Grote added a side comment, noting that the Central Phoenix East Valley Light Rail Project took a total of 12 years from origin to opening day, so the expectation that future studies looking out over a decade was pretty standard for processes within the industry.

Chair Colbath thanked the committee for their discussion and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Ms. Yazzie then asked City of Mesa staff and METRO staff to provide a budgetary number to the committee so that it could be included within the scenario, which she noted would greatly assist in preparing the document. Chair Colbath inquired as to when Ms. Yazzie would need the information, and Ms. Yazzie responded that immediately during the day's meeting would be the most beneficial. She also emphasized that these were MAG region funds and that the MAG Transit Committee needed to make a decision for the Region. She added that if there was a meeting over at METRO, then it would not be inclusive of all of the region's members who sit on the Transit Committee. She reiterated why the Transit Committee was formed in 2009, was to ensure that decisions were made at MAG with full transparency in order to avoid side-conversations and deals amongst a few that would have overall implications for the entire region. She added that if anyone was uncomfortable with suggesting budget items during the meeting, that they may return with that information at the next meeting in April. Discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie summarized the analysis that needed to be performed by the next meeting. The first was looking at the amount of funds requested for Alternatives Analysis with the information then reviewed by the Transit Operators Working Group or METRO's team. A summary of all of the scenarios would also be presented. Mr. Cook also added that at the previous Transit Operators Working Group meeting, there was discussion of how many in the region thought that we may be unable to spend all of the PM dollars and that it was sensible to allocate it for other uses. Discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie offered a revised summary of the last three agenda items as they were all inter-related and the work that needed to be done before the April meeting. A holistic report would be prepared detailing projects in FY 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015 plus a mini update and modifications to that report along with a summary of its effect on remaining funds for preventive maintenance and close-out. She said that she would also prepare an alternative scenario for inclusion of funds for Alternative Analysis utilizing the budget numbers provided by cities and agencies requesting the AA's. Ms. Clemann, Mr. Cook and Ms. Ketcherside all reiterated that the vehicle revenue miles option for Scenario 3 was not what the committee or the elected officials in the region had previously agreed to in 2011. They concurred that the committee adhere with the agreed upon methodology that had been previously agreed upon. Discussion followed.

Ms. Yazzie added that decisions regarding these items needed to be finalized by the May 10th Transit Committee in order to meet the deadlines. Chair Colbath thanked Ms. Yazzie and asked if there were any further questions or comments. Hearing no further comments or questions, Chair Colbath proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

10. Request for Future Agenda Items

Chair Colbath asked the members of the Committee if there were any issues that they would like added as future agenda items. Hearing no further comments, she proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

11. Next Meeting Date

Chair Colbath thanked those present for attending the MAG Transit Committee meeting and she announced that the next meeting of the MAG Transit Committee would be held on Thursday, April 12, 2012, at 10:00 a.m. in the MAG Office, Saguaro Room. There being no further business, Chair Colbath adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.